

Panaji, 31st October, 1985 (Kartika 9, 1907)

SERIES II No. 31

OFFICIAL GAZETTE



GOVERNMENT OF GOA, DAMAN AND DIU

GOVERNMENT OF GOA, DAMAN AND DIU

Department of Personnel and Administrative Reforms

Personnel Division

Order

No. 1/2/83-GA & C

The Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu is pleased to order the following transfer in the cadre of Mamlatdar/Jt. Mamlatdar/Block Development Officer with immediate effect and until further orders: -

- (i) Shri S. S. Kantak, Jt. Mamlatdar, Quepem is transferred and posted as Chief Officer, Sanguem Municipal Council vice Shri A. C. Kamat transferred.
- (ii) Shri A. C. Kamat, Chief Officer, Sanguem Municipal Council is transferred and posted as Jt. Mamlatdar, Quepem vice Shri S. S. Kantak transferred.

2. The transfer of Shri S. S. Kantak in the Sanguem Municipal Council shall be treated as transfer on deputation.

3. Shri S. S. Kantak, Jt. Mamlatdar, Quepem shall move first and relieve Shri Kamat.

By order and in the name of the Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu.

N. P. Gaunekar, Under Secretary (Personnel).

Panaji, 17th October, 1985.

General Administration and Co-ordination Division

Order

No. PER-822/GA&C (Part)

Read: i) Order No. PER/822/SA&C dated 12-10-84.

The period of deputation of Shri U. D. Sharma, ex-Law Secretary to the Government of Goa, Daman and Diu is extended for a further period from 1-5-1985 to 5-8-1985. Shri Sharma will not be entitled to draw deputation (duty) allowance during this period.

This issues with the approval of Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs, New Delhi vide their letter No. 14016/2/84-GP(I) dated 8-10-1985.

By order and in the name of the Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu.

N. P. Gaunekar, Under Secretary (G. A.).

Panaji, 21st October, 1985.

Home Department

General Branch/Division

Notification

No. 2/6/82-HD(G) Part File

In exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to sub-section (1) of section 58 E of the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934 (Central Act 2 of 1934) (hereinafter referred to as the "said Act") read with the Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs, Notification No. U-11030/3/84-UTL dated 12-6-1985, the Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu hereby authorises the Police Officers in-charge of the Police Stations in the Union Territory of Goa, Daman and Diu and who are not below the rank of Sub-Inspector, to make a complaint in writing in respect of any offence punishable under sub-section (5A) of section 58 B of the said Act to any Court having jurisdiction.

By order and in the name of the Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu.

K. N. S. Nair, Under Secretary (Home).

Panaji, 24th October, 1985.

Notification

No. 2/6/82-HD(G) Part file

In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 45 T of the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934 (Central Act 2 of 1934) (hereinafter referred to as the "said Act"), read with the Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs, Notification No. U-11030/3/84-UTL dated 12th June, 1985, the Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu hereby authorises the Police Officers-in-charge of Police Stations in the Union territory of Goa, Daman and Diu and who are not below the rank of sub-Inspector, to apply to any Court having jurisdiction to issue a search warrant under the Code of Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 (Central Act 2 of 1974), for issue of a warrant to search for documents relating to acceptance of deposits in contravention of the provisions of section 45 S of the said Act, believed to be secreted in any place within the local limits of the jurisdiction of such Court.

By order and in the name of the Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu.

K. N. S. Nair, Under Secretary (Home).

Panaji, 24th October, 1985.

Education Department
Physical Education Section

Addendum

No. 190/B. Bhavan/PES/DE/85/372

Read Govt. Order No. 190/B. Bhavan/PES/DE/85/322
dated 27-9-1985.

The following changes/additions have been effected in the above referred Govt. Order:

- 1) The Finance Secretary has been nominated in place of Shri S. K. Gandhe, Special Secretary for Planning, Secretariat, Panaji, at Sr. No. 5 in the above referred Govt. Order as a member by designation and Finance Secretary has been appointed as the Treasurer of the Bal Bhavan Board, Panaji.
- 2) The Director of Health Services has been further nominated as a member of the Bal Bhavan Board, Panaji, in the existing vacancy.

By order and in the name of the Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu.

L. Tochhawng, Director of Education and Additional Secretary to Govt. of Goa, Daman and Diu (Ex-Officio).

Panaji, 23rd October, 1985.

Revenue Department

Notification

No. 22/115/84-RD

Whereas by Government Notification No. 22/115/84-RD dated 12/6/84 published on page 242-243 of Series II, No. 12 of the Official Gazette, dated 21-6-84 it was notified under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as "the said Act") that the land, specified in the schedule appended to the said Notification (hereinafter referred to as the "said land") was likely to be needed for the public purpose viz. L.A. for improvement of road from Maina to Gaonkarwada in village Panchayat Kavrem in Quepem.

And Whereas the appropriate Government (hereinafter referred to as "the Government") is satisfied after consi-

SCHEDULE
(Description of the said land)

Taluka	Village	Survey No.	Sub. Div. No.	Names of the persons believed to be interested	Area in sq. mts
1	2	3	4	5	6
Quepem	Maina	20	2	H: Manguesh Volkunt Sinai Bende.	200.00
		18	6 part	H: Yeshwant Uttam Sinai Ambe.	25.00
		18	8 part	H: Manguesh Volkunt Sinai Bende.	200.00
		18	11 part	H: Yeshwant Uttam Sinai Ambe.	535.00
		48	1 part	H: 1. Mangesh Bende. 2. Uttam Sazro Bende. 3. Gauso Uttam Sinai Bende.	200.00
		48	2 part	H: Uttam Sadashiv Gaunkar.	420.00
		50	1 part	H: Uttam Sadashiv Gaunkar.	1400.00
		51 part	—	H: 1. Uttam Sadashiv Gaunkar. 2. Shankar Sadashiv Gaunkar.	370.00
		44 part	—	H: 1. Uttam Sadashiv Gaunkar. 2. Shankar Sadashiv Gaunkar. T: 1. Chandrakant Devidas. 2. Ushijuto Devidas. 3. Madi Shirjuto Devidas.	1570.00
				Total	4920.00

By order and in the name of the Lt. Governor of Goa, Daman and Diu.

P. S. Nadkarni, Under Secretary (Revenue).

Panaji, 16th October, 1985.

Science, Technology and Environment Department

Order

No. 3-38-85-STE

The Government of Goa, Daman and Diu hereby constitutes a Committee, as indicated below, to formulate the rules and regulations and to recommend to the Government the names for the grant of awards to the deserving Scientists of the Union Territory of Goa, Daman & Diu with a view to encouraging them for the development of Science and Technology:

1. Dr. H. N. Siddiquie, Director, National Institute of Oceanography, Dona Paula — Chairman.
2. Dr. J. D'Souza, Lecturer, Microbiology Department, Post Graduate Centre, Panaji-Goa — Member.
3. Shri Kesava Das, Scientist, National Institute of Oceanography, Dona Paula — Member-Secretary.

The Committee has to submit its report within one month.

By order and in the name of the Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu.

T. J. Faleiro, Under Secretary (S. T. E.).

Panaji, 21st October, 1985.

dering the report made under sub-section (2) of Section 5A of the said Act, that the said land specified in the schedule hereto is needed to be acquired for the public purpose specified above.

Now, Therefore, the Government is pleased to declare under the provisions of Section 6 of the said Act that the said land is required for the public purpose specified above.

2. The Government is also pleased to appoint under clause (c) of Section 3 of the said Act, the Additional Deputy Collector 2-South Margao to perform the functions of a Collector for all proceedings hereinafter to be taken in respect of the said land, and to direct him under Section 7 of the said Act to take order for the acquisition of the said land.

3. A plan of the said land can be inspected at the office of the said Additional Dy. Collector 2-South Margao till the award is made under Section 11.

Notification

No. 22/137/85-RD

Whereas it appears to the appropriate Government (hereinafter referred to as "the Government") that the land specified in the schedule hereto (hereinafter referred to as the "said land") is likely to be needed for public purpose viz. L.A. for construction of road Vassuwado Soriem to Wadi Vassuwado in V. P. Benaulim Salcete Taluka (addl. area).

Therefore the Government is pleased to notify under sub-section (1) of Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as the "said Act") that the said land is likely to be needed for the purpose specified above.

2. All persons interested in the said land are hereby warned not to obstruct or interfere with any surveyor or other persons employed upon the said land for the purpose of the said acquisition. Any contracts for the disposal of the said land by sale, mortgage, assignment, exchange or otherwise, or any outlay commenced or improvements made thereon without the sanction of the Collector appointed in paragraph 4 below, after the date of the publication of this Notification, will under clause (seventh) of Section 24 of the said Act, be disregarded by him while assessing compensation for such parts of the said land as may be finally acquired.

3. If the Government is satisfied that the said land is needed for the aforesaid purpose, a declaration to that effect under Section 6 of the said Act will be published in the Official Gazette, in due course. If the acquisition is abandoned wholly or in part, the fact will be notified.

4. The Government is further pleased to appoint under clause (c) of Section 3 of the said Act the Additional Deputy Collector (2-South) Margao to perform the functions of a Collector under the said Act in respect of the said land.

5. The Government is also pleased to authorise under sub-section (2) of Section 4 of the said Act, the following officers to do the acts, specified therein in respect of the said land.

1. The Collector of Goa, Panaji.
2. The Additional Dy. Collector (2-South) Margao.
3. The Executive Engineer, Works Division VI (R&B) P.W.D. Fatorda Margao.
4. The Director of Land Survey, Panaji.

6. A rough plan of the said land is available for inspection in the office of the Additional Dy. Collector (2-South) Margao for a period of 30 days from the date of publication of this Notification in the Official Gazette.

SCHEDULE

(Description of the said land)

Taluka	Village	Survey No.	Sub-Div. No.	Names of the persons believed to be interested	Approximate area in sq. mts.
1	2	3	4	5	6
Salcete	Benaulim	383	2	Luis Alberto Fernandes & Francisco Antonio Pinto. North: Luis Albert Fernandes & Francisco Antonio Pinto. South: Fabrica de Igreja de Benaulim. East: Gurudas Shankar Kenkre. West: Luis Albert Fernandes & Francisco Antonio Pinto.	10.00
		"	5	Fabrica de Igreja de Benaulim. North: Luis Albert Fernandes & Francisco Antonio Pinto. South: Filomena Lourenco Castelino. East: Sebastiao Gregorio Luis. West: Fabrica de Igreja de Benaulim.	135.00
		"	6	Sebastiao Gregorio Luis. North: Gurudas Shankar Kenkre. South: Ricardina Fernandes. East: Sebastiao Gregorio Luis. West: Fabrica da Igreja de Benaulim.	80.00
		"	9	Ricardina Fernandes. North: Sebastiao Gregorio Luis. South: Road. East: Ricardina Fernandes. West: Filomena Lourenco Castelino & Fabrica da Igreja de Benaulim.	160.00
		"	11	Filomena Lourenco Castelino. North: Fabrica da Igreja de Benaulim. South: Road. East: Ricardina Fernandes. West: Filomena Lourenco Castelino.	30.00
Total					415.00

By order and in the name of the Lt. Governor of Goa, Daman and Diu.

P. S. Nadkarni, Under Secretary (Revenue).

Panaji, 16th October, 1985.

Notification

No. 22/159/85-RD

Whereas it appears to the Appropriate Government (hereinafter referred to as "the Government") that the land specified in the schedule hereto (hereinafter referred to as the "said land") is likely to be needed for public purpose viz. Land Acquisition for widening of two lanes from Km. 21 to 27 of N. H. 17 (part-I).

Therefore the Government is pleased to notify under sub-section (1) of Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as the "said Act") that the said land is likely to be needed for the purpose specified above.

2. All persons interested in the said land are hereby warned not to obstruct or interfere with any surveyor or other persons employed upon the said land for the purpose of the said acquisition. Any contracts for the disposal of the

said land by sale, mortgage, assignment, exchange or otherwise or any outlay commenced or improvements made thereon without the sanction of the Collector appointed in paragraph 4 below, after the date of the publication of this Notification, will under clause (seventh) of Section 24 of the said Act, be disregarded by him while assessing compensation for such parts of the said land as may be finally acquired.

3. If the Government is satisfied that the said land is needed for the aforesaid purpose, a declaration to that effect under Section 6 of the said Act will be published in the Official Gazette in due course. If the acquisition is abandoned wholly or in part, the fact will be notified.

4. The Government is further pleased to appoint under clause (c) of Section 3 of the said Act the Additional Dy. Collector (3-North) Collectorate, Panaji to perform the

functions of a Collector under the said Act in respect of the said land.

5. The Government is also pleased to authorise under sub-section (2) of Section 4 of the said Act, the following Officers to do the acts, specified therein in respect of the said land.

1. The Collector of Goa, Panaji.
2. The Additional Dy. Collector (3-North) Collectorate, Panaji.
3. The Executive Engineer, Works Division XIII, National Highways North Goa P. W. S. Panaji.
4. The Director of Land Survey, Panaji.

6. A rough plan of the said land is available for inspection in the office of the Additional Dy. Collector (3-North) Collectorate, Panaji for a period of 30 days from the date of publication of this Notification in the Official Gazette.

SCHEDULE

(Description of the said land)

Taluka	Village	Survey No.	Sub. Div. No.	Names of the persons believed to be interested	Approximate area in sq. mts.
1	2	3	4	5	6
Pernem	Dhargal	259	1 part	Ghausham Vithal P. Dessai. Baburao Narayan P. Dessai. Gangaji Pandurang P. Dessai. Raghunath Pangaji P. Dessai. Shivaji Govind Dessai Parsekar. Govind Balkrishna P. Dessai. Vaman Vishnu P. Dessai. Purushottam Fondu P. Dessai. Government of Goa.	525.00
		223	1 part	Rukmini Ladkoba P. Dessai. Uttam Ramchandra R. Dessai. Jaivanti Ganpat Mathakar. Kashibai Pandurang P. Dessai. Ghanasham Yeshwant P. Dessai. Raghunath Keshav P. Dessai. Mahadeo Ghansham P. Dessai. Rauji Tukaram P. Dessai. Jairam Balkrishna P. Dessai. Uttam Gopal P. Dessai.	275.00
		223	2 part	Raghunath Keshav P. Dessai. Mahadeo Ghausham P. Dessai. Rauji Tukaram P. Dessai. Bhalkrishna Gopal P. Dessai. Shivram Balkrishna P. Dessai. Kashibai Pandurang P. Dessai. Ghausham Yeshwant P. Dessai. Jaivantibai Ganpat Mathakar. Uttam Ramchandra P. Dessai. Rukmini Ladkoba P. Dessai. Madusudan Nilkanth P. Dessai. Baburao Narayan P. Dessai. Govind Shivram P. Dessai. Atmaram Shivram P. Dessai. Ghanasham Vittal P. Dessai. Laxman Narayan P. Dessai. Gangaji Pandurang P. Dessai. Raghunath Gangaji P. Dessai. Shivaji Govind P. Dessai. Vaman Vishnu P. Dessai. Govind Balkrishna P. Dessai. Balkrishna Ladkoba P. Dessai. Government of Goa.	2950.00
		223	3 part	Raghunath Keshav P. Dessai. Mahadeo Ghausham P. Dessai. Rauji Tukaram P. Dessai. Jairam Balkrishna P. Dessai. Balchandra Gopal P. Dessai. Gangaji Pandurang P. Dessai. Ghanasham Yeswant P. Dessai. Uttam Ramchandra P. Dessai. Rukmini Ladkoba P. Dessai. Rajendra Vasudeo Deshpabhu. Balkrishna Dattaji Khadpe. Kashibai Pandurang P. Dessai. Jaivanto Ganpat Mathakar. Dattibai Kastira Dhargalkar. Jaganath Hariji Kolwalkar.	190.00

1	2	3	4	5	6
Pernem	Dhargal	224	3 part	Raghunath Keshav P. Dessai. Mahadeo Ghanasham P. Dessai. Rauji Tukaram P. Dessai. Balchandra Gopal P. Dessai. Jairam Balkrishna P. Dessai. Kashibai Pandurang P. Dessai. Ghanasham Yeshwant P. Dessai. Jaivantibai Ganpat Mthankar. Uttam Ramchandra P. Dessai. Rukmini Ladkoba P. Dessai. Madhusudan Nilkant P. Dessai. Govind Shivram Dessai. Atmaram Shivram P. Dessai. Ghanasham Vithal P. Dessai. Government of Goa. Baburao Narayan P. Dessai. Laxman Narayan P. Dessai. Raghunath Gangaji P. Dessai. Shivaji Govind Dessai. Vaman Vishnu P. Dessai. Govind Balkrishna P. Dessai. Balkrishna Ladkoba Dessai. Education Department of Goa, Daman and Diu.	1550.00
		224	4 part		250.00
		224	6 part	Raghunath Keshav P. Dessai. Mahadeo Ghanasham P. Dessai. Rauji Tukaram P. Dessai. Balchandra Gopal P. Dessai. Jairam Balkrishna P. Dessai. Kashibai Pandurang P. Dessai. Ghanasham Yeshwant P. Dessai. Jaivantibai Ganpat Mathakar. Uttam Ramchandra P. Dessai. Rukmini Ladkoba P. Dessai. Madhusudan Nilkanth P. Dessai. Govind Shivram P. Dessai. Atmaram Shivram P. Dessai. Ghanasham Vithal P. Dessai. Baburao Narayan P. Dessai. Laxman Narayan P. Dessai. Raghunath Gangaji P. Dessai. Gangaji Pandurang P. Dessai. Shivaji Govind Dessai Parsekar. Government of Goa. Vaman Vishnu P. Dessai. Govind Balkrishna P. Dessai. Balkrishna Ladkoba P. Dessai.	75.00
		224	7 part	Raghunath Keshav P. Dessai. Mahadeo Ghansham P. Dessai. Rauji Tukaram P. Dessai. Balchandra Gopal P. Dessai. Jairam Balkrishna P. Dessai. Kashibai Pandurang P. Dessai. Ghanasham Yeshwant P. Dessai. Jaivantibai Ganpat Mathakat. Uttam Ramchandra P. Dessai. Rukmini Ladkoba P. Dessai. Madhusudan Nilkanth P. Dessai. Govind Shivram P. Dessai. Atmaram Shivram P. Dessai. Ghanasham Vithal P. Dessai. Baburao Narayan P. Dessai. Laxman Narayan P. Dessai. Raghunath Gangaji P. Dessai. Shivaji Govind Dessai. Government of Goa. Vaman Vishnu P. Dessai. Govind Balkrishna P. Dessai. Balkrishna Ladkoba P. Dessai.	50.00
		227	14 part	Raghunath Keshav P. Dessai. Mahadeo Ghansham P. Dessai. Rauji Tukaram P. Dessai. Balchandra Gopal P. Dessai. Jairam Balkrishna P. Dessai. Kashibai Pandurang P. Dessai. Ghanasham Yeshwant P. Dessai. Jaivantibai Ganpat Mathakar. Uttam Ramchandra P. Dessai. Rukmini Ladkoba P. Dessai. Madhusudan Nilkant P. Dessai. Govind Shivram P. Dessai. Atmaram Shivram P. Dessai. Ghanasham Vithal P. Dessai. Baburao Narayan P. Dessai. Laxman Narayan P. Dessai. Raghunath Gangaji P. Dessai. Shivaji Govind P. Dessai.	125.00

1	2	3	4	5	6
Pernem	Dhargal	227	14 part	Govind Balkrishna P. Dessai. Vaman Vishnu P. Dessai. Balkrishna Ladkoba P. Dessai. Government of Goa.	
			13 part	Madhusudan Nilkant P. Dessai.	375.00
		119	4 part	Madan Daji Naik.	155.00
		119	3 part	Madan Daji Naik. Narayan Yeso Vaskar. Rajendra Vasudeo Deshpabhu.	30.00
		119	2 part	Shamsundar Vassudeo Bandothkar. Madan Daji Naik.	320.00
			6 part	Narayan Masso Vaskar.	25.00
			5 part	Rajendra Deshpabhu.	700.00
		200	1 part	Radhabai Namdeo Kaloji.	450.00
		211	1 part	Raghunath P. Dessai. Mahadeo Ghansham P. Dessai. Rauji Tukaram P. Dessai. Jairam Balkrishna, & Dessai. Bhalchandra Gopal P. Dessai. Gangaji Pandurang P. Dessai. Rashunath Gangaji P. Dessai. Kakibai Pandurang P. Dessai. Rajendra Vassudeo D. Prabhu. Balkrishna Dattaji Khadpe. Ghanasham Yeshwant P. Dessai. Uttam Ramchandra P. Dessai. Rukmini Ladkoba P. Dessai. Jaivanti Yeshwant Mathakar. Dattibai Kashula Dhargalkar. Jaganath Hiraji Kolwalkar. Krishna Murari Kolwalkar. Govind Jaideo Khalap. Laximidar Balkhishna Khalap. Balchandra Sadashiv Khalap.	350.00
			2 part	Raghunath Keshav P. Dessai.	110.00
			3 part	— do —	90.00
			4 part	— do —	90.00
			5 part	— do —	80.00
			6 part	— do —	200.00
			7 part	Owner (as per Sr. No. 211/1).	200.00
			8 part	— do —	150.00
			9 part	— do —	175.00
			10 part	— do —	175.00
			11 part	— do —	175.00
			12 part	— do —	165.00
			13 part	— do —	300.00
			14 part	Anant Shankar Dhargalkar. Wishwanath Ganesh S. Dhargalkar. Jaivant Rama Khalap. Krishna Rama Khalap.	200.00
		210	1 part	Rajendra Vassudeo D. Prabhu.	3500.00
			2 part	Vithal Purshottam Dangui.	950.00
		209	12 part	Madhukar, Krishnaji Shenai.	170.00
			11 part	Vithal Purshottam Dangui. Anant Shankar S. Dhargalkar. Vishwanath Ganesh S. Dhargalkar.	2175.00
		204	1 part	Gopal Ramchandra P. Dessai. Baburao Gopal Dhargalkar. Appa Babaji Dhargalkar.	1200.00
Pernem	Shargal	202	20 part	Vishwanath Ganesh S. Dhargalkar. Anant Shankar S. Dhargalkar. Krishna Rama Khalap. Radendra Vassudeo D. Prabhu. Raghuraj Vassudeo D. Prabhu.	300.00
			19 part	Savitri Vishwanath Dangui. Vithal Purshottam Dangui. Chandrakant Hari Yeshi.	900.00
		203	23 part	Rajendra Vassudeo Deshpabhu.	1150.00
		160	3 part	Gopal Ramchandra Prabhu Dessai. Bablo Gopal Dhargalkar. Appa Babaji Dhargalkar.	1250.00
Total					22100.00

By order and in the name of the Lt. Governor of Goa, Daman and Diu.

P. S. Nadkarni, Under Secretary (Revenue).

Panaji, 17th October, 1985.

Notification

No. 22/131/85-RD

Whereas it appears to the Appropriate Government (hereinafter referred to as "the Government") that the land specified in the schedule hereto (hereinafter referred to as the "said land") is likely to be needed for public purpose viz. L. A. for construction of road from Velsao to Dando in V. P. Velsao (Addl. area).

Therefore the Government is pleased to notify under sub-section (1) of Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as the "said Act") that the said land is likely to be needed for the purpose specified above.

2. All persons interested in the said land are hereby warned not to obstruct or interfere with any surveyor or other persons employed upon the said land for the purpose of the said acquisition. Any contracts for the disposal of the said land by sale, mortgage, assignment, exchange or otherwise, or any outlay commenced or improvements made thereon without the sanction of the Collector appointed in paragraph 4 below, after the date of the publication of this Notification, will under clause (seventh) of Section 24 of the said Act, be disregarded by him while assessing compensation for such parts of the said land as may be finally acquired.

3. If the Government is satisfied that the said land is needed for the aforesaid purpose, a declaration to that effect under Section 6 of the said Act will be published in the Official Gazette, in due course. If the acquisition is abandoned wholly or in part, the fact will be notified.

4. The Government is further pleased to appoint under clause (c) of Section 3 of the said Act the Additional Dy. Collector (2-South) Margao to perform the functions of a Collector under the said Act in respect of the said land.

5. The Government is also pleased to authorise under sub-section (2) of Section (4) of the said Act, the following officers to do the acts, specified therein in respect of the said land.

1. The Collector of Goa, Panaji.
2. The Additional Dy. Collector (2-South) Margao.
3. The Executive Engineer, Works Division VI (R&B) P. W. D. Fatorda Margao.
4. The Director of Land Survey, Panaji.

6. A rough plan of the said land is available for inspection in the office of the Additional Dy. Collector (2-South) Margao for a period of 30 days from the date of publication of this Notification in the Official Gazette.

SCHEDULE

(Description of the said land)

Taluka	Village	Survey No.	Sub. Div. No.	Names of the persons believed to be interested	Approximate area in sq. mts.
1	2	3	4	5	6
Marmugao	Pale	5	10	Government of Goa, Daman & Diu as per D. C. No. 32. North: Teotónio Britto Carvalho. South: Antonio Dias Barreto. East: Govt. of Goa, Daman & Diu as per D. C. No. 32. West: Fabrica de Igreja de Velsao.	60.00
		8	18	Govt. of Goa, Daman & Diu as per D. C. No. 49. North: Maria Ismenia dos Mercês Pereira. South: Victor Carvalho. East: Govt. of Goa, Daman & Diu as per D. C. No. 49. West: — do —	130.00
		8	17	Maria Ismenia dos Mercês Pereira. North: Lucio D'Souza. South: Govt. of Goa, Daman & Diu, as per D. C. No. 49. East: Maria Ismenia dos Mercês Pereira. West: Maria Ismenia dos Mercês Pereira.	135.00
		8	2	Olimpio Vaz Barreto. North: Maria Ismenia dos Mercês Pereira. South: Victor Carvalho. East: Olimpio Vaz Barreto. West: Govt. of Goa, Daman & Diu as per D. C. No. 49.	5.00
		12	2	Florinda Carvalho & Rita Mariana Antanazia D'Souza. North: Estevao Pereira. South: Tito Jeroneo Britto & Jose Carlos Britto. East: Florindo Carvalho & Rita Mariana Antonizila D'Souza. West: — do —	450.00
Total					780.00

By order and in the name of the Lt. Governor of Goa, Daman and Diu.

P. S. Nadkarni, Under Secretary (Revenue).

Panaji, 16th October, 1985.

Notification

No. 22/143/85-RD

Whereas it appears to the Appropriate Government (hereinafter referred to as "the Government") that the land specified in the schedule hereto (hereinafter referred to as the "said land") is likely to be needed for public purpose viz. Land Acquisition for construction of Modern Jail Complex at Colvale.

Therefore the Government is pleased to notify under sub-section (1) of Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as the "said Act") that the said land is likely to be needed for the purpose specified above.

2. All persons interested in the said land are hereby warned not to obstruct or interfere with any surveyor or other persons employed upon the said land for the purpose of the said acquisition. Any contracts for the disposal of the said land by sale, mortgage, assignment, exchange or otherwise, or any outlay commenced or improvements made thereon without the sanction of the Collector appointed in paragraph 4 below, after the date of the publication of this Notification, will under clause (seventh) of Section 24 of the said Act, be disregarded by him while assessing compensation for such parts of the said land as may be finally acquired.

3. If the Government is satisfied that the said land is needed for the aforesaid purpose, a declaration to that effect under Section 6 of the said Act will be published in the Official Gazette, in due course. If the acquisition is abandoned wholly or in part, the fact will be notified.

4. The Government is further pleased to appoint under clause (c) of Section 3 of the said Act the Additional Dy. Collector (H. Q. II) Collectorate, Panaji to perform the functions of a Collector under the said Act in respect of the said land.

5. The Government is also pleased to authorise under sub-section (2) of Section (4) of the said Act, the following officers to do the acts, specified therein in respect of the said land.

1. The Collector of Goa, Panaji.
2. The Additional Dy. Collector (H. Q. II) Collectorate, Panaji.
3. The Inspector General of Prisons, Collectorate, Panaji.
4. The Director of Land Survey, Panaji.

6. A rough plan of the said land is available for inspection in the office of the Additional Dy. Collector (H. Q. II) Collectorate, Panaji for a period of 30 days from the date of publication of this Notification in the Official Gazette.

SCHEDULE

(Description of the said land)

Taluka	Village	Survey No.	Sub. Div. No.	Names of the persons believed to be interested	Approximate area in sq. mts.
1	2	3	4	5	6
Bardez	Camurlim	107	1	Lawachandra Dattaram Govandalkar. T: Thako Gangu Varang.	2300.00
			2	Lawachandra Dattaram Govandalkar. T: Sitaram Rama Naik.	3475.00
			3	Lawachandra Dattaram Govandalkar. T: Dattaram Ganha Naik.	2050.00
			4	Lawachandra Dattaram Govandalkar. T: Thako Gangu Varang.	2300.00
			5	Lawachandra Dattaram Govandalkar. T: Sadassiv Morajkar alias Kannaik.	5600.00
			6	Lawachandra Dattaram Govandalkar.	4075.00
		104	7	— do —	6725.00
			0	Comunidade. T: 1. Poput Shiva Naik Gaonkar. 2. Gangaram Morto Goltekar.	93775.00
		103	0	Comunidade. T: 1. Tukaram S. Naik. 2. Hari Shankar Naik. 3. Paris Nagoji Naik. 4. Namdeo Krishna Naik. 5. Pandalik Shiva Naik. 6. Gangaram M. Goltekar.	107075.00
		109	0	Victor Lobo. T: Nages Atmaram Naik.	22600.00
		108	0	Comunidade. T: Gangaram Morto Goltekar.	35250.00
		111	1	Comunidade. T: 1. Gopal Ravji Naik. 2. Gangaram M. Goltekar.	325.00
		111	2	Comunidade. T: 1. Raghunath Sakroji Naik. 2. Gangaram M. Goltekar.	350.00
		111	3	Comunidade. T: 1. Sitaram Narba Naik. 2. Gangaram M. Goltekar.	375.00
		111	4	Comunidade. T: 1. Dattaram Ganha Naik. 2. Gangaram M. Goltekar.	875.00
		111	5	Comunidade. T: 1. Yeshwant Sakharam Sawant. 2. Gangaram Morto Goltekar.	675.00
		111	6	Comunidade. T: 1. Yeshwant Nagoji Naik. 2. Gangaram Morto Goltekar.	775.00
		111	7	Comunidade. T: 1. Shankar Hari Naik. 2. Gangaram Morto Goltekar.	1075.00
		110	0	Comunidade. T: Gangaram Morto Goltekar.	81200.00

1	2	3	4	5	6
Bardez	Camurlim	114	0	Comunidade. T: Gangaram Morto Goltekar. North: S. No. 105, S. No. 94, S. No. 95, S. No. 98, S. No. 99, S. No. 100, S. No. 102, S. No. 101. South: S. No. 112, S. No. 111/1 to 7, S. No. 114, Road. East: Village boundary of Colvale. West S. No. 105, Road.	14375.00
Bardez	Colvale	175	1	O: Comunidade of Colvale.	700.00
			2	T: Premavati Shabi Naik.	575.00
			3	O: Comunidade of Colvale.	675.00
			4	T: Hari Keshav Naik.	650.00
			5	O: Comunidade of Colvale.	700.00
			6	T: Prabhakar Krishna Naik.	750.00
			7	O: Comunidade of Colvale.	650.00
			8	T: Sakharan Deu Naik.	775.00
			9	O: Comunidade of Colvale.	775.00
			10	T: Ladu Gunaji Parcenkar.	650.00
			11	O: Comunidade of Colvale.	825.00
			12	T: Ganpat Krishna Naik.	800.00
				O: Comunidade of Colvale.	
				T: Narayan Rama Saptoji.	
				North: S. No. 278.	
				South: S. No. 162, S. No. 161.	
				East: Road.	
				West: Village boundary of Camurlim village.	
			13	O: Comunidade of Colvale.	800.00
			14	T: Popat Laxman Saptoji.	1100.00
				O: Comunidade of Colvale.	
		428	1	T: Bhati Shamji Naik.	975.00
			2	O: Comunidade of Colvale.	900.00
			3	T: Gunaji Sakharan Padte.	775.00
			4	O: Comunidade of Colvale.	425.00
			5	T: Pandurang Revodkar.	375.00
			6	O: Comunidade of Colvale.	475.00
			7	T: Annapurna Gopal Salgaokar.	425.00
			8	O: Comunidade of Colvale.	375.00
			9	T: Sakharan Tanulo Revadkar.	1050.00
			10	O: Comunidade of Colvale.	725.00
				T: Ladu Gunaji Parcenkar.	825.00
		178	1	O: Comunidade of Colvale.	325.00
			2	T: Gurudas Sakharan Poke.	275.00
			3	O: Comunidade of Colvale.	150.00
			4	T: Pandurang Asolkar.	100.00
			5	O: Comunidade of Colvale.	125.00
			6	T: Annapurna Gopal Salgaokar.	125.00
			7	O: Comunidade of Colvale.	125.00
			8	T: Sakharan Tanulo Revadkar.	125.00
			9	O: Comunidade of Colvale.	475.00
			10	T: Premavati Datta Parcenkar.	400.00
			11	O: Comunidade of Colvale.	150.00
			12	T: Dhondur Saulo Naik.	75.00
			13	O: Comunidade of Colvale.	100.00
			14	T: Sudhan Rama Naik.	100.00
			15	O: Comunidade of Colvale.	100.00
				T: Ganpat Krishna Naik.	100.00
				O: Comunidade of Colvale.	100.00
				T: Annapurna Gopal Salgaokar.	100.00
				O: Comunidade of Colvale.	100.00
				T: Ladu Gunaji Parcenkar.	100.00
				O: Subhadra Arjun Mandrekar.	100.00
				T: Joao Francisco Lima.	100.00
				O: Lavinga Mascarenha.	100.00
				T: Subhadra Arjun Mandrekar.	100.00
				O: Joao Francisco Lima.	100.00

1	2	3	4	5	6
Bardez	Nachinola	176	16	O: Lavina Mascarenha.	450.00
			17	O: 1. Subhadra Arjun Mandrekar.	
				2. Lavina Mascarenha.	
				3. Joao Francisco Lima.	
Bardez	Colvale	174	1	O: Subhadra Arjun Mandrekar.	625.00
			2	O: Lavina Mascarenha.	925.00
			3	O: Joao Francisco Lima.	125.00
			4	O: Subhadra Arjun Mandrekar.	100.00
			5	O: Lavina Mascarenha.	175.00
			6	O: Joao Francisco Lima.	1400.00
			7	O: Subhadra Arjun Mandrekar.	775.00
			8	O: Lavina Mascarenha.	425.00
			9	O: Joao Francisco Lima.	250.00
			10	O: Subhadra Arjun Mandrekar.	250.00
			11	O: Lavina Mascarenha.	225.00
			12	O: Joao Francisco Lima.	175.00
			13	O: Subhadra Arjun Mandrekar.	625.00
			14	O: Lavina Mascarenha.	125.00
			15	O: Joao Francisco Lima.	150.00
			16	O: Subhadra Arjun Mandrekar.	200.00
			17	O: Lavina Mascarenha.	600.00
			18	O: Joao Francisco Lima.	575.00
			19	O: Francisco Lima.	500.00
			20	O: Lavina Mashcarenha.	475.00
			21	O: Joao Francisco Lima.	500.00
			22	O: Subhadra Arjun Mandrekar.	500.00
			23	O: Lavina Mascarenha.	450.00
			24	O: Joao Francisco Lima.	400.00
			25	O: Subhadra Arjun Mandrekar.	375.00
			26	O: Lavina Mashcarenha.	400.00
			27	O: Joao Francisco Lima.	1250.00
			28	O: Subhadra Arjun Mandrekar.	725.00
			29	O: Lavina Mashcarenha.	275.00
			30	O: Joao Francisco Lima.	250.00
			31	O: Subhadra Arjun Mandrekar.	225.00
			32	O: Lavina Mashcarenha.	200.00
			33	O: Joao Francisco Lima.	500.00
			34	O: Lavina Mashcarenha.	775.00
			35	O: 1. Subhadra Arjun Mandrekar.	100.00
				2. Lavina Mashcarenha.	
				3. Joao Francisco Lima.	
		171	—	O: Comunidade of Colvale.	95700.00
		172	—	T: Ladu Gunaji Parcenkar.	
				O: Comunidade of Colvale.	4850.00
		173	—	T: Sukhaji Mahadev Dhargalkar.	
				O: Comunidade of Colvale.	2625.00
				T: Sukhaji Mahadev Dhargalkar.	
Total					524525.00

By order and in the name of the Lt. Governor of Goa, Daman and Diu.

P. S. Nadkarni, Under Secretary (Revenue).

Panaji, 11th October, 1985.

Notification

No. 22/136/85-RD

Whereas it appears to the Appropriate Government (hereinafter referred to as "the Government") that the land specified in the schedule hereto (hereinafter referred to as the "said land") is likely to be needed for public purpose viz. L. A. for widening of road from Nachinola Water Tank to Aldona Main road.

Therefore the Government is pleased to notify under sub-section (1) of Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as the "said Act") that the said land is likely to be needed for the purpose specified above.

2. All persons interested in the said land are hereby warned not to obstruct or interfere with any surveyor or other persons employed upon the said land for the purpose of the said acquisition. Any contracts for the disposal of the said land by sale, mortgage, assignment, exchange or otherwise, or any outlay commenced or improvements made thereon without the sanction of the Collector appointed in paragraph 4 below, after the date of the publication of this Notification, will under clause (seventh) of Section 24 of the said Act, be disregarded by him while assessing compensation for such parts of the said land as may be finally acquired.

3. If the Government is satisfied that the said land is needed for the aforesaid purpose, a declaration to that effect under Section 6 of the said Act will be published in the Official Gazette, in due course. If the acquisition is abandoned wholly or in part, the fact will be notified.

4. The Government is further pleased to appoint under clause (c) of Section 3 of the said Act the Additional Dy. Collector (3-North) Collectorate, Panaji to perform the functions of a Collector under the said Act in respect of the said land.

5. The Government is also pleased to authorise under sub-section (2) of Section (4) of the said Act, the following officers to do the acts, specified therein in respect of the said land.

1. The Collector of Goa, Panaji.
2. The Additional Dy. Collector (3-North) Collectorate, Panaji.
3. The Executive Engineer, Works Division II (R&B) P.W.D. Panaji.
4. The Director of Land Survey, Panaji.

6. A rough plan of the said land is available for inspection in the office of the Additional Dy. Collector (3-North) Collectorate, Panaji for a period of 30 days from the date of publication of this Notification in the Official Gazette.

SCHEDULE
(Description of the said land)

Taluka	Village	Survey No.	Sub-Div. No.	Names of the persons believed to be interested	Approximate area in sq. mts.	
1	2	3	4	5	6	
Bardez	Nachinola	77	5 part	Pedro Vincent D'Souza.	20.00	
			2 part	Teodolinda Lobo.	175.00	
			3 part	Bernadina D'Mello.	100.00	
			4 part	Luiza Cruz.	200.00	
		78	5 part	Luiza Cruz.	20.00	
			6 part	Remedios Santana D'Mello.	150.00	
			7 part	Claudia A. Piedade D'Souza.	120.00	
			8 part	Evita D'Souza.	55.00	
			9 part	1. Tereza Gomes. 2. Maria C. Correia. 3. Evila D'Souza.	20.00	
		81	1 part	O: Bernadin D'Mello. T: Shankar Maujkar.	210.00	
			2 part	O: Santa M. C. T: Harichandra P. Naik.	170.00	
		1	5 part	O: Dr. Silveir Mario D'Souza.	30.00	
			1 part	O: Church Property St. B. Jesus.	355.00	
			2 part	Comunidade.	1150.00	
			4 part	Comunidade Nachinola.	10.00	
			15 part	Camilo D'Souza.	65.00	
			16 part	Julio Gomes.	65.00	
			17 part	Caetano R. D'Mello.	55.00	
			18 part	Bernandin Nazareth.	70.00	
			19 part	Aguis Nazareth & 5 others.	20.00	
			24 part	Camilo D'Cruz.	50.00	
			9 part	Manuel F. D'Cruz.	120.00	
			10 part	2. Caetan D'Cruz.		
				Confraria De Nachinola.	40.00	
			11 part	Benjamin Marteris.	40.00	
				2. Edward Marteris. 3. Anjela Marteris.		
			2	8 part	Antonio Saldanha.	260.00
				2. Margarita S. 3. Maria Saldanha. 4. Edelina Saldanha.		
			5 part	Anton F. C. Botolo.	45.00	
				Alex S. B. Rodrigues.	90.00	
				Agnes Nazareth & 5 others.	95.00	
				2 part	Antonio Sequeira & Natividas Sequeira.	50.00
		32	2 part	Comunidade.	120.00	
			8 part	Anton F. C. S. Betelo.	60.00	
		15	14 part	Brazilia M. D'Souza.	150.00	
			13 part	Henry Carvalho.	80.00	
		12 part	O: Comunidade.	460.00		
			6 part	T: Vassant P. Corjuenkar. O: Comunidade.	15.00	
		11 part	T: Manohar P. Govenkar.			
			O: Comunidade.	60.00		
		10 part	O: Victor Castelino.	85.00		
			O: Comunidade.	20.00		
		8 part	Caetano Martris.	225.00		
			Comunidade.	20.00		
		7 part	Prasilda Matris.	100.00		
			Comunidade.	80.00		
		5 part	Rosa M. Mascarenhas.	25.00		
			Comunidade.	260.00		
		1 part	Anant V. S. Raicar.	20.00		
			7 part	Alex S. B. Rodrigues.	80.00	
		32	6 part	1. Agnes Nazareth. 2. Albert Nazareth. 3. Fred Nazareth. 4. William Nazareth. 5. Francis Nazareth.	60.00	
			5 part	Comunidade Nachinola.	20.00	
		4 part	O: Salvador Sequeira.	80.00		
			2. Francisco Sequeira. 3. Fernande Sequeira.			
		3 part	T: Laximi Parenkar.			
			O: Antonio Sequeira.	140.00		
		1 part	2. Natividade Sequeira.			
			David D'Souza.	130.00		
		31	12 part	O: Benando S. Lobo.	50.00	
			2. Manuel F. Lobo.			
		11 part	David D'Souza.	80.00		
			1. Luciano T. Mario Nazareth.	150.00		
		10 part	2. Edward Nazareth.			
			9 part	Uttam A. Vaingankar.	70.00	
		8 part	Tereza Gomes.	60.00		
			2. Bras Gomes.			

1	2	3	4	5	6
Bardez	Nachinola	31	7 part 6 part 5 part 4 part 3 part 2 part	Pundalik V. Dhond. Fidalis P. D'Souza. Felix C. P. D'Souza. Felix C. D'Souza. Eslinda Saldanha. Anuciasao Rapoz.	150.00 60.00 75.00 50.00 215.00 25.00
North: S. No. 77/5, 2, 3, 4, road, S. No. 1/3, 4, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 8, 24, 9, 10, 11, S. No. 2/8.					
South: Road, S. No. 78/5, 6, 7, 8, 9, S. No. 81/1, 2, 5, S. No. 1/1, 2, 7, S. No. 64/1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, S. No. 63/1, 2, 3.					
East: S. No. 77/4, 5, S. No. 78/9, Road, Nala, S. No. 1/3, 4, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, S. No. 64/8, S. No. 32/2, 8, 7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 1, S. No. 31/12, 11, 10, 9, 8, 7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, S. No. 15/14, 12, 13, 6, 10, 9, 8, 7, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1.					
West: Road, Nala, S. No. 1/2, 7, S. No. 64/1, 2, 3, 4, S. No. 1/20, S. No. 2/5, 4, 3, 2.					
Total					7125.00

By order and in the name of the Lt. Governor of Goa, Daman and Diu.

P. S. Nadkarni, Under Secretary (Revenue).

Panaji, 16th October, 1985.

Public Health Department

Order

No. 5/140/80-PHD-Vol. I

On the recommendation of the Union Public Service Commission, Dr. Manjunath Kamath M. is hereby appointed to the post of Medical Officer/Rural Medical Officer/Junior School Health Officer in the Directorate of Health Services and posted as Junior School Health Officer at Primary Health Centre, Valpoi against the vacant post on regular basis and on the terms and conditions contained in the Government Memorandum of even number dated 8-3-85. Dr. Kamath should report to his place of posting immediately.

Dr. Manjunath Kamath is medically examined and found fit by the Medical Board.

By order and in the name of the Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu.

S. V. Bhadri, Under Secretary (Health).

Panaji, 17th October, 1985.

Corrigendum

No. 5/140/80-PHD-Vol. I

Read: Government order No. 5/140/80-PHD-Vol. I dated 4-7-83.

In the above referred Government order, the date appearing in the 5th line may be read as 24-1-83 instead of "January 1983".

By order and in the name of the Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu.

S. V. Bhadri, Under Secretary (Health).

Panaji, 24th October, 1985.

Corrigendum

No. 3-13/5/85-PW & UD

Read: - Govt. order No. 3-13/5/85-PW & UD dated 10-10-85.

In Govt. order read above, the designation of Shri A. Barbosa may be substituted as Mamlatdar, Quepem instead of Block Development Officer, Quepem.

By order and in the name of the Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu.

A. V. Pimenta, Under Secretary (PW & UD).

Panaji, 24th October, 1985.

Industries and Labour Department

Order

No. 28/25/85-ILD

The following Award given by the Industrial Tribunal, Goa, Daman and Diu is hereby published as required under the provisions of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947).

By order and in the name of the Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu.

Subhash V. Elekar, Under Secretary (Industries and Labour).

Panaji, 3rd October, 1985.

IN THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL GOA, DAMAN AND DIU, PANAJI GOA

(Before Dr. Renato de Noronha, Hon'ble Presiding Officer)

Reference No.: IT/41/85

Workmen, rep. by The President Goa Trade and Commercial Workers' Union

— Party I

V/s.

M/s. Bandekar Alloy Steel Pvt. Ltd.

— Party II

Panaji. Dated: 25-9-1985

REPORT

The Government of Goa, Daman and Diu, by its order No. 28/25/85-ILD dated August 6, 1985, has referred for the adjudication by this Tribunal of an industrial dispute between the above parties. The schedule annexed to the order of reference reads as follows:

1. Whether the demand of Goa Trade and Commercial Workers' Union for 4 pay scales with 4 different grades of the workmen employed at M/s. Bandekar Alloy Steel Private Limited, Vasco da Gama, Goa factory as served by the Union under their Charter of demands dated 15-6-84 is justified?
2. If not, to what revision of wages the said workmen are entitled to?
3. Whether the demand of the workmen for fixed D. A., V. D. A., Travelling Allowance, Shift Allowance, Heat Allowance and Canteen Allowance are legal and justified?
4. If not, to what reliefs the workmen are entitled to?"

2. Both the parties were duly served with notice to file their statements. On the date fixed, none of them remained present nor did they file their statement of claim and written statement.

3. In the absence of the parties and their written statements, I am unable to proceed with this reference and, hence, this report to the Government with a request to treat this reference as disposed off.

Dr. Renato de Noronha

Presiding Officer
Industrial Tribunal

Order

No. 28/4/85-ILD

The following Award given by the Industrial Tribunal, Goa, Daman and Diu is hereby published as required under the provisions of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947).

By order and in the name of the Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu.

S. V. Bhadri, Under Secretary (Industries and Labour).

Panaji, 7th October, 1985.

**IN THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL GOA, DAMAN & DIU
PANAJI GOA**

(Before *Dr. Renato de Noronha*, Hon'ble Presiding Officer)

Reference No.: IT/24/76

Shri Agnelo Pereira

— Workman/Party I

V/s.

M/s. Rama Yeshwant Naik
& Sons

— Employer/Party II

Panaji, Dated: 13-9-1985

AWARD

The Government of Goa, Daman and Diu, by its Order No. CLE/1/ID(54)/75/IT-16/75/76/1425 dated 13th September, 1976, has referred for the adjudication by this Tribunal of an industrial dispute between the above parties. The schedule annexed to the order of reference reads as follows:

"Whether the action of the Management of M/s. Rama Yeshwant Naik and Sons, Margao, Goa in terminating the services of Shri Agnelo Pereira, with effect from 4th April, 1975 is legal and justified;

If not to what relief the concerned workman is entitled?"

2. The case of the workman/party I, as per his statement of claim, is as follows: The workman/party I was appointed as incharge of spare parts depot and the motor garages of M/s. Rama Yeshwant Naik and Sons (Party II) at Navelim, Salcette on 17-10-1967 and has worked for them upto 4-4-1975. Party II informed the workman on 31-3-1975 verbally that, due to rise in the cost of vehicles, their sales have dwindled with the result that there is slack in business and as such they do not require the services of the workman any more. This is, otherwise, a stereotype reason they always give when they want to get rid of the services of their employees. On 4-4-1975 the employers have taken over the charge of the spare parts depot of the garage from the workman and that too without the payment of any wages for the 4 days the workman worked during April 1975, and the employer forced the workman to quit the services. He was appointed on a monthly salary of Rs. 175/- with an annual increment of Rs. 10/-, which was never given. The termination of the services of the workman was done without any notice or formal letter. He was in the services of the employer since 17-10-1967 on a permanent basis. The matter was taken up before the Labour Commissioner, who took up conciliation proceedings and finally submitted a failure report, which resulted in this reference. No charge was framed against the workman prior to the termination of his services, nor any inquiry held. He was also not paid of his legal dues. Hence, his termination is illegal and unjustified and the workman is entitled to re-

instatement with full back wages, since the month of April 1975 with continuity of services and all other benefits attached to his employment.

3. The employer/party II, in their written statement, have stated that the workman never worked as an incharge to spare parts and motor garage at Navelim. He was working as an ordinary Salesman, and left the job on his own for going abroad and again after some months he returned begging for services. He was taken as a fresh recruit. So, his contention that he was in service from October 1967 to 1975 is incorrect. The workman was very irregular in his attendance and not doing his duties. He was all the while busy in his own private work other than his official work. Due to the negligence of the workman in doing his duties properly, tremendous loss was caused to the employer. The wages of the workman were paid and his contention that he was forced to quit services is incorrect. He was appointed on temporary basis and not as a permanent employee. He was always telling the employer that he wants to go abroad and not interested in the job. He was also very irregular in attending his duties. Sometimes, for days together, he was not coming to office without informing the employer. He had some private business of his own and so he had no time to do the work of the employer. The workman had expressed his desire to resign but was not giving his resignation in writing. The employer still kept him but, ultimately, it was found that the workman was not at all interested in the job. The employer has not removed the workman but the workman of his own wanted to leave the job. It is denied that the services were illegally terminated. The question of reinstatement does not arise as the workman himself was not interested in the job and when he has expressed his desire to resign. Hence, the workman is not entitled to any reliefs as prayed for by him.

4. On 29-5-1979, the workman submitted an application to this Tribunal with a copy sent by registered post with A/D to the Opponent, in which he has stated as follows:

"1. After prolonged unemployment, the workman secured employment at Bahrain in the Gulf from 1st March 1978 and as such could present himself before this court but was represented by Mr. M. S. Berne.

3. The workman is not interested any longer in the reinstatement in the service from the 1st March, 1978, the date on which he was employed overseas.

4. The workman prays that this Honourable Court call upon the employers to settle the dues of the workman arising out of the following:

a) The workman was in the service of the employer from 17-10-1967 to 31-3-1975. During this period no leave wages were paid in lieu of leave for the period of 7 years, 5 months and thirteen days which works out at the rate of 15 days per each year of service, to 109 days payable at the rate of 175/- per month (the last salary received) to Rs. 635-47).

b) No bonus paid by the employer to the workman. Bonus for 7 years at 8.33 p.c. works out to Rs. 1,225/-.

c) No notice pay was paid to the workman in lieu of notice of termination which is Rs. 175/-.

d) No gratuity was paid at the rate of 15 days wages to the workman upon termination of his services by the employers, which works out to Rs. 612-50 (salary being Rs. 175/- p.m.).

e) No termination compensation was paid to the workman at the rate of 15 days wages. This works out to Rs. 612-50.

Calculating all the dues from (a) to (e) as indicated here:

a)	Rs. 635-47
b)	Rs. 1,225-00
c)	Rs. 175-00
d)	Rs. 612-50
e)	Rs. 612-50
	<hr/> Rs. 3,260-47"

5. By order dated 7-2-1980 of my Ld. Predecessor Dr. Coelho, Adv. Gude appearing as representative of the employer was not allowed, in view of the objection raised by the applicant.

6. Following issues were framed in this case by Dr. Coelho:

"1. Do the employers/party II prove that they are justified in terminating the services of the workman/party I?

2. Do the workman/party I prove that his services has been terminated illegally and without any notice whatsoever?

3. Do the employers/party II prove that the workman/party I left his services of his own?

4. Do the employers/Party II prove that the workman/party I was irregular in attending the Office and was neglecting his duties and thereby has caused tremendous loss to the company?

5. Do the employers/party II prove that all the dues of the workman/party I have been paid?"

7. On the days fixed for evidence, neither the workman nor the employer remained present and so the evidence regarding both the parties was declared closed by the Tribunal. An application moved by the workman to set aside the order for ex-parte proceedings against him and to allow him a fresh opportunity to lead evidence was rejected by the Court.

8. The order of reference has put on the employer the burden to prove the legality and justification of the termination order of the services of the workman. However, the employer did not lead any evidence in this connection.

From the pleadings of the parties, the following facts can be considered as admitted:

i) The workman/party I was employed by the employer/party II in his spare parts department at Navelim since 17-10-1967 on a monthly salary of Rs. 175/-. His services were verbally terminated on 4-4-1975 without any notice or pay in lieu thereof.

9. Whether the workman was a permanent employee, as contended by him, or a temporary employee, as contended by the employer, it does not make any difference. Since it is not disputed that he has put in continuous service for more than one year, the termination of the services of the workman for any reason whatsoever would come within the definition of "Retrenchment" under Section 2(00), as it has been laid down in the ruling of the S. C. in the case of L. Robert D'Souza V/s. Executive Engineer, Southern Railway and another reported in 1982 S. C. Cases (Labour and Services) 124. In this ruling, it has been held that, except if the case falls within any of the expected categories:

"(i) Who is subject to the Army Act, 1950, or the Air Force Act, 1950, or the Navy (Discipline) Act, 1934; or

(ii) Who is employed in the police service or as an officer of other employee of a prison; or

(iii) Who is employed mainly in a managerial or administrative capacity; or

(iv) Who, being employed in a supervisory capacity, draws wages exceeding five hundred rupees per mensem or exercises, either by the nature of the duties attached to the office or by reason of the powers vested in him, functions mainly of a managerial nature."

It would come within the purview of 'retrenchment' under Section 25F of the Act.

The employer, therefore, had to comply with the conditions precedent, specified under Section 25F of the Act, namely one month's notice or pay in lieu thereof and payment of gratuity at the rate of 15 days for each year of service at the time of termination of the services of the workman, which he has failed to do. It is well settled today that the non compliance of the conditions precedent, specified in Section 25F of the Act, makes the retrenchment order invalid and inoperative and, consequently, the workman is to be considered in service with continuity and entitled to full back wages. It is to be noted, however, that the workman himself, by his application dated 29-5-1979 referred to above, has stated that he is not interested in the reinstatement, as he has already secured a job in the gulf from 1st March, 1978 and prayed that the employer be directed to pay him the amounts mentioned in the said application.

10. As, in case the workman was reinstated, the employer would have to pay him much more than what he has claimed, in the above application, I grant his request and pass the following order:

ORDER

The termination of the services of the workman by the employer is illegal and unjustified. Since the workman is

not interested in his reinstatement, the employer is directed to pay him the amount mentioned in his application dated 29-5-1979 totalling Rs. 3,260/47. Costs of Rs. 200/- to be paid by the employer to the workman.

Dr. Renato de Noronha
Presiding Officer
Industrial Tribunal

Order

No. 28/4/85-ILD

The following Award given by the Industrial Tribunal, Goa, Daman and Diu is hereby published as required under the provisions of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947).

By order and in the name of the Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu.

S. V. Bhadri, Under Secretary (Industries and Labour).

Panaji, 18th October, 1985.

IN THE LABOUR COURT GOA, DAMAN & DIU, PANAJI GOA

(Before Dr. Renato de Noronha, Hon'ble Presiding Officer)

Application No.: LCC/33/84.

Shri Babu V. L.

— Applicant

V/s.

Mr. R. Mohan C/o., Shirodkar Bros.
Engg. Works.

— Opponent

Panaji. Dated: 4-10-1985

AWARD

This is an application under Section 33C(2) of the I.D.A., 1947, in short the Act, filed by the above applicant against the above Opponent, claiming from the latter the total amount of Rs. 2,368/10; as per the details shown in the annexure to the application.

2. It is applicant's case that he was working for the Opponent and has not been paid his wages, overtime, notice pay, leave wages, gratuity and retrenchment compensation, as shown in the annexure.

3. The Opponent was issued notice, but could not be served and so the notice was published in the newspapers. On the date fixed, the Opponent did not turn up and so the case was adjourned and fresh date fixed for ex-parte evidence of the applicant. The applicant gave his statement in Open Court and produce his attendance and overtime cards, which have been taken on record and marked as Exh A-1 colly. In his statement before the Court, the applicant has stated that he was working as Fitter for the contractor, R. Mohan and that he was not paid him wages of 15 days at the rate of Rs. 17/- per day for the month of April 1984, totalling Rs. 272/-. He has also worked overtime with the same contractor in the month of April 1984 during 15 days in all 112 hours amounting to Rs. 476/- and in the month of June 43 hours amounting to Rs. 90-10, for which he has not been paid.

4. From the statement of the applicant and the attendance and over time cards produced by him, I am satisfied that the Opponent has to pay him the amount of his wages and overtime above mentioned. The other items mentioned under serial nos. 2 to 5 in the annexure have not been referred to by the workman in his statement and, therefore, it appears that he has dropped them.

5. In view of the above, I grant this application and pass the following order:

ORDER

The Opponent is directed to pay to the applicant the total amount of Rs. 838-10. Costs of Rs. 100/- to be paid by the Opponent to the workman.

Dr. Renato de Noronha
Presiding Officer
Labour Court

Order

No. 28/4/85-ILD

The following Award given by the Industrial Tribunal, Goa, Daman and Diu is hereby published as required under the provisions of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947).

By order and in the name of the Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu.

Subhash V. Elekar, Under Secretary (Industries and Labour).

Panaji, 3rd October, 1985.

IN THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL GOA, DAMAN AND DIU, PANAJI-GOA

(Before Dr. Renato de Noronha, Hon'ble Presiding Officer)

Reference No.: IT/34/73

Workmen

— Party I

V/s.

M/s. Polygot Publications and their Contractor,
Shri Jagdish B. Rao.

— Party II

Party I represented by Shri N. J. Rebelo, General Secretary of The Newspaper and Press Employees' Union.

Party II represented by Late Shri Ramesh Dessai, Labour Consultant.

Panaji. Dated: 9-9-1985.

AWARD

The Government of Goa, Daman and Diu, by its Order No. LC/1/ID(48)/73/IT-16/73/1314 dated 3rd November 1973, has referred for the adjudication by this Tribunal of an industrial dispute between the above parties. The schedule annexed to the order of reference reads as follows:

1. Whether the action of the Management of M/s. Polygot Publications, Rua Jose Falcao, Panaji (Goa) and their Contractor, Shri Jagdish B. Rao, Panaji (Goa) in refusing to comply with the following demands of their workmen, is justified;

If not, to what relief the workmen concerned are entitled and from what date?

- a) Issues of letter confirming the workmen in their services;
- b) Grant of V. D. A. according to the Wage Board recommendations for Working Journalists and Non-Working Journalists;
- c) Leave facilities;
- d) Rent intervals and arrangements for night shift employees;
- 2) Whether the action of the Management of M/s. Polygot Publications (Goa) and their Contractor, Shri Jagdish B. Rao, Panaji (Goa) in refusing employment to the workmen listed in Annexure 'A' with effect from 26th August 1973 is legal and justified;

If not, to what relief the workmen concerned are entitled?"

2. The Union, in its Statement of claim, has stated that the workmen whose names appear in the annexure 'A' to the order of reference and who are all members of the Union were employed by M/s. Polygot Publications, referred by the Union as Employer in their composing section in the categories mentioned against their names in the said annexure 'A'. The employer is one of the undertakings of Sequeira group of industries which published an English Daily newspaper 'Goa Monitor' since about July 1972. In the expectation of better prospects most of the workers left their services of several years with their previous employers and joined the employer. The publication of the employer consisted of 3 sections, namely Administrative, Editorial and composing section all situated in the same premises. The staff employed in all the three sections belonged to the employer. All the machinery and accessories in the composing section also belonged to the employer. For all the matters connected with their employment, the workers were under the control and supervision of their

Superiors in the editorial and administrative sections, though departmentally the foreman were head of the composing section. Since the beginning Shri Jagdish Rao was in the employment of the employer and held managerial position, performing executive functions and even issuing cheques on behalf of the employer. The employer did not maintain books or registers as required under the law. The procedure followed was completely illegal, no appointment letters were issued to the employees, no records were maintained and, even the salaries were paid to them by cheques. By letter No. NAPEU/GM/1/73 dated 5-3-1973, addressed to the Manager of the employer, the Union submitted a charter of demands of the employees. The employer did not comply with the said demands nor replied to the said letter. The Union then approached the Labour Commissioner's office, conciliation proceedings took place but the representatives of the employer did not remain present and so no conciliation could take place. Finally, the Union, by its letter 5/73 dated 30-7-1973, gave an ultimatum to the employer and after specifically stating out the demands of the workers called upon the employer to implement the same, failing which the workers would go on indefinite strike from 10-8-1973. The employer, in reply, informed the Union by their letter dated 7-8-1973 that they have no compositors in their employment, which contention, according to the Union, is false. The workmen went on strike from 10-8-1973, of which due notice was given to the employer. Thereafter, the employer falsely and dishonestly put forward the contention that Shri Jagdish Rao was the employer of the workers, which contention is false since they have been always the employees of the employer. The Assistant Labour Commissioner admitted the dispute in conciliation and served notices upon the employer and Shri Jagdish Rao to attend the proceedings but neither of them attended. In view of the confused situation created by the employers, the Union formally addressed a letter dated 20-8-1973 to Shri Jagdish Rao, wherein reiterated, through him, the demands of the workers upon the employer. The Union also sent letters dated 25-8-1973 and 27-8-1973 to the employer and Shri Rao informing them that in view of the intervention of the Labour Commissioner's office to settle the matters peacefully, they withdraw the strike and the workers shall resume work of 1st shift on 27-8-1973 from 2.00 p.m. In reply to this letter, the employer falsely informed the Union by their letter dated 27-8-1973 that none of their employees have been on strike and so the question of any worker resuming work did not arise. Shri Rao also replied that the question of resuming work does not arise as he has no such workers. Except the workman at serial No. 21 in annexure 'A' in whose case a separate dispute was raised; all the workers reported for work but they were illegally and wrongfully refused work by the employer. Such action of the employer is wholly unjustified. By letter dated 6-9-1973 addressed to the employer and Shri Rao, the Union called upon to reinstate the workers with full back wages and continuity of service and also to give them the benefits as demanded in the Charter of Demands. The employer replied that all his employees are peacefully at work and Shri Rao also replied that he has not declared lock out at any time or refused employment on any day. The Union submits that it cannot be said that Shri Rao was the employer of the workers as he himself was in the employment of the employer and that this is a calculated fraud and antilabour policy followed by the employer to disown them.

It is prayed that the action of the employer be held as illegal and unjustified and the workers reinstated in services with continuity and full back wages. It is also prayed that the demands made by the workers to the employer which are mentioned in the order of reference be granted, which demands the Union has tried to justify in its statement of claim.

3. M/s. Polygot Publications who, in the written statement, has named itself as Management, has raised a preliminary objection regarding the maintainability of this order of reference for the following reasons:

- a) There is no dispute between the Management and the employees as Polygot Publications has stopped its activities from 22-12-1973 and during the period the firm was carrying on its business had employed about 13 employees whose names are given in annexure 'A' to the written statement;
- b) That there were no demands submitted by their staff to the Management at any time;
- c) The Assistant Labour Commissioner without any jurisdiction or in excess of his jurisdiction instituted conciliation proceedings as well as a failure report as nullity in law in the absence of any demands or an

industrial dispute between the Management and the employees. Consequently, the order of reference of the Government based on such failure report as also the nullity in law;

- d) The order of reference covers 2 employers including the Management which is against the provisions of law;
- e) The Government has not applied its mind while issuing the order of reference in question;
- f) The demands listed in the order of reference were not served by the Union upon the Management;
- g) The Management is not the employer for the purpose of industrial dispute alleged to have been raised by the Union;
- h) That except the workman under serial No. 21, Martin Fernandes in the annexure 'A' to the order of reference, the others were not employed by the Management and in the case of Shri Martin Fernandes, the workers or the Union has not served any demand upon the Management;
- i) That in the absence of employer-employee relationship, no industrial dispute can exist similar being the position in the absence of any demand made by the workers on the Management.

It is submitted that the order of reference has wrongfully impleaded the Management in the order of reference and, as such, the order is bad in law.

On merits: It is admitted the receipt of the Union letter dated 5-3-1973 and stated that no demand was incorporated in the said letter on behalf of Shri Martin Fernandes, serial No. 21 of the annexure 'A'. The Union sent another letter dated 19-3-1973 informing that the employees would join one day token strike as per the directive of the Federation. In this letter, the Union admitted that there existed a dispute between the Management and its employees. In response to the letters of the Labour Commissioner, the Management informed the names of the members of its staff who had joined the Union or raised the dispute. On 30-7-1973, the Union served a strike notice upon the Management and listed therein certain demands. Regarding letter dated 6-9-1973 the Union, it is stated that there was no strike by its employees and also no lock out and/or refusal of employment by the Management. The report submitted by the Assistant Labour Commissioner has made wrong and distorted statements in order to prejudice the mind of the Government against the Management. It is submitted that none of the employees of the Management were members of the Union nor have they authorised a Union to raise any industrial dispute on their behalf. It is prayed, in short, that the reference be disposed off for want of jurisdiction and held that the Management has been wrongly impleaded as a party.

4. Shri Jagdish Rao, who names himself as the employer, also filed his written statement raising similar preliminary objections as in the statement of the Management. On the merits, it is stated that the Management of M/s. Polygot Publications approached the employer for certain work and the employer undertook to compose all the matter for their daily newspaper 'Goa Monitor' and at the prescribed rate. The employer, therefore, had to engage a number of workers under its employment and, accordingly, it engaged, in mutual agreed terms and conditions, the workers mentioned in Annexure 'A' to the order of reference, except the one under serial No. 21. On 10-8-1973, all the workers employed by the employer did not report for work nor gave any intimation in regard to the cause of their absence. The employer, therefore, on 10-8-1973, displayed a notice on the notice board to their workers numbering about 18 in the presence of 3 witnesses. Individual notices by registered post with A/D were also sent on 11-8-1973 to 18 workers. In the individual notices the workers were informed that since they had not reported for work the employer presumed that they have abandoned their services and their names were removed from the muster roll. They were however, given 8 days time to give satisfactory explanation in writing regarding their absence, in which case the period of absence would be considered as leave without pay. Regarding the other 4 workers, namely those at serial numbers 3, 22, 25, and 13 similar notices were sent on 14-8-1973 and 17-8-1973, respectively. On account of the absence of the above employees, the employer was unable to fulfil the contractual obligations to Goa Monitor till 17-8-1973. Till 17-8-1973, neither the Union nor the workmen informed the employer of their joining the Union or about their demands. The worker under serial No. 12 was absconding from 10-7-1973 and never turned up thereafter. The worker under serial No. 25 submitted his explanation on

25-8-1973 and was allowed to resume duties after his sickness. He worked till the date of the closure of the business. The worker Martin Fernandes was never in the employment of the employer. The worker under serial No. 23 submitted his resignation and collected his dues. The one under serial No. 24 left the job from May 1973. On 20-8-1973, the Union submitted its demands which were received by the employer on 22nd. In this letter, in which abusive language was used, it was admitted that the workers on whose behalf the demands of M/s. Polygot Publications were made were employed by the employer as early as March 1973. On 25-8-1973, the employer received a communication from the Union, that the workers would withdraw the strike w.e.f. 27-8-1973. The Union had never informed the employer before that the workers would go on strike from 10-8-1973. None of the workers except Shri Anthony D'Souza, serial No. 25 gave any explanation regarding their absence nor informed that they have gone on strike. It is submitted that on the date of receipt of this communication the workers were no longer in service of the employer by virtue of the notices issued on 11-8-1973 and 17-8-1973. The employer never refused employment to any of the workers. In the remaining portion of his statement, the employer tries to show that the demands made by the workmen are not justified.

5. By application dated 26-4-1973, the Union requested the Court to direct both the employers to produce registers and documents listed in the said application. Polygot Publications filed its replies to this application on 10-7-1976 and 3-8-1976.

6. Following issues were framed by my Ld. Predecessor Shri Kholali:—

- "1. Whether the workmen covered under reference, made any demands upon Shri J. B. Rao and M/s. Polygot Publications?
2. Whether the Union is entitled to make demands on M/s. Polygot Publications in absence of employer-employee relationship?
3. Whether M/s. Polygot Publications is the employer of the workmen covered under the order of reference?
4. Whether the reference is bad in law in view of the fact that two employers are employing same set of workmen?
5. Whether the reference survives in view of the fact that the establishments of both the employers closed since 22nd December 1973?
6. Whether the workmen are entitled to raise demands upon Shri J. B. Rao when on the date of demands no relationship existed between the workmen and the employer?
7. Whether the demands are justified and if so what relief?"

7. After issues were framed and evidence recorded on the preliminary points, arguments of the Ld. Rep. of the parties were heard and now the matter is before me for passing order.

8. Among the issues framed there is one under serial No. 4; referring to the maintainability of the order of reference on the basis of the fact that 2 employers are shown as employing same set of workmen. The said issue under No. 4 reads as follows:

"Whether the reference is bad in law in view of the fact that 2 employers are employing the same set of workmen?"

I shall take up first this issue, as it goes to the very root of the jurisdiction of this Tribunal to entertain this reference.

9. The order of reference as published by the Government has submitted for the adjudication of this Tribunal: Whether the action of the Management of M/s. Polygot Publication and their contractor Shri Jagdish Rao in refusing to comply with the demands of the workmen and in refusing employment to them (the names of the employees are specified in the order of reference) is legal and justified?

10. Since the employees in respect of M/s. Polygot Publication and the contractor Shri Jagdish Rao are the same and since under the Contract Labour (Regulations and Abolition) Act 1970 and the Rules framed there under, the principal employer is liable only under certain circumstances for the payment of wages of the workmen engaged by the contractor, which liability is also subsidiary, the first thing that the Tribunal will have to investigate is who is the em-

ployer of the workmen in question? i.e. whether M/s. Polygot Publications or the Contractor Jagdish Rao.

Such investigation, however, the Tribunal cannot undertake because it would amount to travel beyond the terms of reference, and unless a finding is given on this point, the Tribunal shall not be able to dispose off this reference.

11. I, therefore, uphold the contention of M/s. Polygot Publications and their contractor that the reference in question is bad in law, as it refers to the same set of workers under 2 different employers at the same time, which is not admissible. This reference therefore, stands dismissed with no order as to costs.

Dr. Renato de Noronha
Presiding Officer
Industrial Tribunal

Order

No. 28/33/85-ILD

Whereas the Lieutenant Governor of Goa, Daman and Diu is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the Electricity Department, Government of Goa, Daman and Diu, Panaji and their workman Shri Sebastian Fernandes, Assistant Wireman of the Electricity Department, represented through Goa Trade & Commercial Workers' Union, in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule annexed hereto (hereinafter referred to as the 'said dispute');

And whereas the Lieutenant Governor of Goa, Daman and Diu considers it expedient to refer the said dispute for adjudication.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Lieutenant Governor of Goa, Daman and Diu hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal of Goa, Daman and Diu, Panaji, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

"Whether Shri Sebastian Fernandes, Asst. Wireman of the Electricity Department, Government of Goa, Daman and Diu, Panaji is a workman as defined under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947)?"

If the answer to the above question is in the affirmation, whether the action of the employer, the Chief Electrical Engineer, Government of Goa, Daman and Diu, Panaji-Goa, in terminating the services of Shri Sebastian Fernandes with effect from 13-9-1983 is legal and justified?

If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to?

By order and in the name of the Lieutenant Governor of Goa, Daman and Diu.

S. V. Bhadri, Under Secretary (Industries and Labour).

Panaji, 16th October, 1985.

Order

No. 28/42/85-ILD

Whereas the Lieutenant Governor of Goa, Daman and Diu is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the management of M/s. Pimenta Cement Products, Murida, Fatorda, Margao, Salcete-Goa, and their workmen represented through Goa Trade and Commercial Workers' Union, Opposite Municipal Garden, Panaji-Goa, in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule annexed hereto (hereinafter referred to as the 'said dispute');

And whereas the Lieutenant Governor of Goa, Daman and Diu considers it expedient to refer the said dispute for adjudication.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Lieutenant Governor of Goa, Daman and Diu hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal of Goa, Daman and Diu, Panaji-Goa, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the employer, M/s. Pimenta Cement Products, Murida, Fatorda, Margao, Salcete-Goa, in terminating the services of the following 5 workmen w.e.f. 4-4-1985 is legal and justified: -

Sl. No.	Name of the worker
1.	Shri Camilo Dias
2.	Shri Jose Silva
3.	Shri Ramchandra Shirodkar
4.	Shri Joao Furtado
5.	Shri Francis Gaonkar.

If not, to what relief the workmen are entitled to?"

By order and in the name of the Lieutenant Governor of Goa, Daman and Diu.

S. V. Bhadri, Under Secretary (Industries and Labour).

Panaji, 17th October, 1985.

Law Department

Establishment Branch

District and Sessions Court

Order

No. DSC/JO/L/159/85/3625

Shri R. K. Batta, Addl. Sessions Judge and Civil Judge, Sr. Division, Mapusa, is hereby granted Earned Leave for 2 days w.e.f. 18-10-1985 to 19-10-1985 with permission to suffix 20-10-1985 being Sunday.

Certified that but for proceeding on leave he would have officiated as Addl. Sessions Judge and Civil Judge, Senior Division.

On return from leave, Shri R. K. Batta, is reposted as Addl. Sessions Judge and Civil Judge, Sr. Divn. Mapusa.

Alvaro de Noronha Ferreira, District and Sessions Judge.

Panaji, 19th October, 1985.

Order

No. DSC/JO/L/159/85/3610

Ex-post facto sanction is hereby granted for availing of Earned Leave for 14 days from 28-8-1985 to 10-9-1985 with permission to prefix 27-8-1985 being Holiday by Shri Anand D. Salkar, Civil Judge, Junior Division and J. M. F. C. Diu.

Certified that but for leave he would have officiated as Civil Judge, Jr. Division and J. M. F. C. Diu.

On return from leave Shri A. D. Salkar is reposted as Civil Judge, Jr. Division and J. M. F. C. Diu.

Alvaro de Noronha Ferreira, District and Sessions Judge.

Panaji, 19th October, 1985.